

Remarks:

This application has been reviewed carefully in view of the Office Action mailed November 6, 2006 ("the Office Action"). In the Office Action, claim 57 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1, 13, 20, 22, 24, 33 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Henze (US 5,926,004). Claims 45-47, 52, 54, 55, 58 and 62-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Henze. Claims 14, 16-17, 21, 48, 50-51 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Henze and Gilbert (US 6,357,011). Claims 15 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Henze and Gilbreth (US 2003/0007369). Claims 26 and 56 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Henze.

The applicants note with appreciation that claims 59 and 60 were allowed. The applicants also note with appreciation that claim 28 was considered allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and claim 57 was considered allowable if amended to depend from claim 56 to overcome the above stated 112nd paragraph rejection, and rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above-described objections and rejections are addressed as follows:

1. INTERVIEW

Applicants appreciate the time taken by Examiner Andrew Deschere and Supervisory Patent Examiner Brian Sircus, in conducting a telephone interview on February 6, 2007. As noted in the accompanying interview summary, the participants discussed the scope of the invention, and the claim language that all parties could agree would overcome the rejections based on the cited art. Applicants note that the examiners were in agreement that inherent in the disclosure of applicants' invention were power converters having a capacity above the primary power port power rating.

2. § 112 REJECTION

Claim 57 was rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicants claim as the invention. The applicants have amended claim 57 to depend from claim 56, as suggested by the Examiner. The applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 57, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, be withdrawn.

3. THE INDEPENDENT CLAIMS

Claim 1, as amended, recites the following features:

one or more power converters configured to receive power from the primary power port and to provide power to the plurality of secondary power ports, the one or more power converters having a capacity to receive power from the primary power port at a level above the primary power port power rating, and

a system controller including a power controller configured to regulate the power received from the primary power port by the one or more power converters to below the primary port power rating.

Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 45, 61 and 62.


The cited art fails to disclose a power controller configured to regulate the power received from a primary power port to a level below the primary power port power rating, and further fails to disclose power converters configured to receive power from the primary power port at a level above the primary power port power rating. Because the cited art fails to disclose the features of the presently claimed invention, the applicants respectfully request the rejections of all independent and dependent claims still pending in the application be withdrawn.

4. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN et al.

By: 
John A. Griecci
Registration No. 39,694
For: The Law Office of John A. Griecci

703 Pier Avenue, Suite B #657
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254
(310) 376-6527